

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/685,307	Applicant(s) KITTOCK ET AL.	
	Examiner Alison K. Pickard	Art Unit 3676	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Alison K. Pickard. (3) _____
 (2) Wei-Ning Yang. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 22 March 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: all of record (see attached proposed amendments).

Identification of prior art discussed: all of record (esp. Olsen).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: applicant submitted proposed amendments to the claims to further define over, at least Olsen. The proposal, for at least claim 1, appears to overcome Olsen as a 102 reference. However, Olsen may still be applied as a teaching reference. Applicant argued that the present invention has an initial gap that does not change over operating conditions. In other words, Applicant's seal does not require a fluid pressure (as does Olsen's) to constrict it to the desired clearance. Neither Applicant nor the examiner could come up with specific language to convey this. Regardless, the proposed amendments would require further search and/or consideration..